



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09 627,979	07/28 2000	Randy H. Y. Lo	UPA-00156	3057

7590 11/20/2002

Jason Z Lin  
19597 Via Monte Drive  
Saratoga, GA 95070

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DILINH P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2814	

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/627,979	LO ET AL.
	Examiner DiLinh Nguyen	Art Unit 2814

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 August 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 41-45, 47-54, 56 and 57 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 41-45, 47-54, 56 and 57 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_

5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)  Other \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 41-45, 47-54 and 56-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkateshwaran et al. (U.S. Pat. 6339254) in view of Rostoker et al. (U.S. Pat. 5648661) and further in view of Akram et al. (U.S. Pat. 5994166).

Venkateshwaran et al. disclose a semiconductor device (fig. 2) comprising:

a substrate 211;

at least two chips packages 201, each of the chip packages being a packaged chip module having a bare chip packaged;

a plurality of electrical connect points 202 –203 electrically connecting the chip packages with the substrate;

a plurality of electrical connect pins 230; and

a package material enclosing the connect points and the chip package.

Venkateshwaran et al. fail to disclose the packaged chip module having a bare chip packaged and embedded therein, burn in tested and function tested.

Rostoker et al. disclose a plurality of dice 102 have passed both burned- in and function tests (figs. 2A-3A, column 8, lines 45-58 and column 30, lines 31-37) to detect chips that are defective at wafer level and reduce the cost for the semiconductor device.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Venkateshwaran et al. to detect chips that are defective at wafer level by burn in tested, function tested and reduce the cost for the semiconductor package device, as shown by Rostoker et al.

Venkateshwaran et al. and Rostoker et al. disclose the claimed invention except for not specifically point out that the package material enclosing the substrate.

Akram et al. disclose a semiconductor device (cover fig.) comprising:

a package material 172 (column 6, line 26) enclosing a substrate 140 (column 6, line 61), a connect points and a chip packages to achieve densely packaged semiconductor device (abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Venkateshwaran et al. and Rostoker et al. to achieve densely packaged semiconductor device, as shown by Akram et al.

- Regarding claims 49-50, Venkateshwaran et al. disclose the bare chip 201 is bonded to the substrate by wire bonding or flip chip bonding.
- Regarding claims 42 and 51, Venkateshwaran et al. disclose the claimed invention and also the chip package is a chip-scale package (column 5, lines 48-50).
- Regarding claims 43 and 52, Venkateshwaran et al. disclose at least one of the chip packages is a wire bonding 203 package.
- Regarding claims 44 and 53, Venkateshwaran et al. disclose at least one of the chip packages is a flip chip bonding package.

- Regarding claims 45 and 54, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to form one of the chip packages is a central pad bonding package.
- Regarding claims 47 and 56, Venkateshwaran et al. disclose the plurality of electrical connect pins are solder balls.
- Regarding claims 48 and 57, Venkateshwaran et al. disclose the plurality of electrical points are solder balls 202.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DiLinh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-6983. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 6:00PM (M-F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on (703) 308-4918. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

DLN  
November 15, 2002

*DiLinh Nguyen*  
SU  
TAKAHASHI, KOBAYASHI & KAWAMURA  
1000 LEADERSHIP DR., SUITE 100  
FORT WORTH, TX 76137-2300  
(817) 695-0000  
(817) 695-0000 FAX